

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

MARIE WOODY,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. CIV-14-0691 MV/LAM

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

**ORDER FINDING AS MOOT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
TO RESPOND TO DISCOVERY REQUESTS**

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Defendant's opposed *Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Plaintiff's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production* (Doc. 22), filed March 4, 2015. Plaintiff filed a response to the motion on March 18, 2015 [Doc. 23], and Defendant filed a reply on March 31, 2015 [Doc. 26]. Having considered the motion, response, reply, record of this case, and relevant law, the Court **FINDS** that the motion is **MOOT**.

Defendant's motion asks the Court to extend Defendant's deadline to respond to Plaintiff's First Requests for Production from March 2, 2015 to March 27, 2015, and to extend its deadline to respond to Plaintiff's First Interrogatories from March 4, 2015 to March 27, 2015. [Doc. 22 at 1]. Defendant states that the extension is necessary due to several dates during which counsel for both parties were out of the office. *Id.* at 2. In Plaintiff's response to the motion, Plaintiff states that she is willing to concur with the extension as long as Defendant does not include a lot of objections to the discovery requests. [Doc. 23 at 3]. However, since Plaintiff and Defendant were unable to agree to Plaintiff's proposed conditions, Plaintiff opposes the extension. *Id.* In Defendant's reply to the motion, Defendant states that it served responses and objections to the discovery requests, along with over 1500 pages of documents and materials, on March 26, 2015. [Doc. 26

at 4] (the Court notes that Defendant also states that it served responses to the discovery requests on March 27, 2015, *see Doc. 26* at 1, n.1). Because Defendant has already responded to Plaintiff's discovery requests, and because Plaintiff's objection to Defendant's request for an extension of time required briefing on the issue that extended past the requested extended deadline, the Court finds that Defendant's motion is now moot.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant's *Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Plaintiff's First Interrogatories and Requests for Production* (Doc. 22) is found to be **MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



LOURDES A. MARTÍNEZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE